arXiv:1612.05784v1 [math.FA] 17 Dec 2016

New Constructions and Characterizations of Grassmannian Fusion Frames and Packings

Emily J. King

December 20, 2016

Abstract

Configurations of subspaces which are in some sense optimally spread apart, and in particular which have reconstruction properties which emulate that of orthonormal bases, are useful in various applications, such as wireless communications and quantum information theory. Again and again the relationship between such analytico-geometric configurations and various structures in discrete mathematics have been shown. In this paper, a novel construction of infinite classes of equichordal subspace packings built on semiregular divisible difference sets is presented. Furthermore, integrality conditions which characterize when such subspace packings can have orthonormal bases or orthonormal projections with entries in a subring of the algebraic integers are proven. A generalization of numerous different constructions which use known packings to build new configurations and which appear all over the literature is given, as well as the characterization of a long list of desirable geometric properties which the construction preserves. While many papers on subspace packings focus only on so-called equiisoclinic or equichordal arrangements, attention is also given to configurations like subspaces which saturate the orthoplex bound and this are optimal outside of the parameter regime where equiisoclinic and equichordal packings can occur. **Keywords:** fusion frame, Grassmannian packing, difference

sets, simplex bound, orthoplex bound, character tables, Walsh functions **AMS Classification:** 42C15, 05B10,14M15,15B34,05B20

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

The motivation is to find optimal configurations of subspaces which are of interest geometrically but also in applications like coding theory [Cre08, PWTH16, XZG05, KP03, KPCL09], quantum information theory [SS98, GR09], and more. The usefulness of such configurations comes from how far the subspaces can be spread apart. In this paper combinatorial design theory and a bit of algebraic number theory will show themselves to be quite useful in constructing and/or characterizing these collections of subspaces.

A basic goal of finite-dimensional harmonic analysis is to take linear measurements of data (e.g., rank k projections) in a way that is in some sense optimal. The measurements are chosen such that in the absence of noise and erasures, they can be used to perfectly reconstruct the original data. The question is how to design the measurements such that they are optimally robust against errors. If the measurements we take are projections onto the one-dimensional subspaces spanned by elements of an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$ for the ambient space of data, then it is a standard result of linear algebra that we can reconstruct the data x perfectly from uncorrupted measurements $\{\langle \cdot, e_i\rangle e_i\}$:

$$x = \sum_i \langle x, e_i\rangle e_i.$$

However, if one of the coefficients $\langle x, e_i\rangle$ goes missing, then an entire dimension of information is lost. Thus for robustness, one might take additional inner products. Suppose $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is an

orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then clearly taking the measurements $\langle \cdot, e_1 \rangle, \langle \cdot, e_2 \rangle, \langle \cdot, e_2 \rangle$ will not be robust to erasures since losing the first measurement would still result in a loss of an entire dimension of information. Finding the best configuration for one-dimensional linear measurements is the same as solving the geometric problem of finding an optimal packing in certain Grassmannian spaces. That is, we are looking for one-dimensional subspaces that are as spread out as possible. When the measurements are more generally projections onto higher dimensional subspaces, the problem remains a Grassmannian packing problem. Systems of rank one projections (resp., higher rank projections) which yield perfect reconstruction in the absence of noise and erasures are called tight frames (resp., tight fusion frames). We do not simply focus on finding geometrically optimal configurations but also care about when the resulting measurements are easily implementable.

In general, Grassmannian fusion frames, which are tight fusion frames which correspond to optimal packings of certain Grassmannian spaces with respect to the chordal distance, are optimally robust against noise and erasures. Under certain models of noise and erasures, a type of Grassmannian fusion frame called equichordal is shown to be optimal [KPCL09, SAH14, EKB10]. Under other models, the subclass of Grassmannian fusion frames which are called equiisoclinic have been proven to be the best [Bod07], while for certain coding theory regimes such packings are not optimal [PWTH16]. For the sake of implementability, we in particular are interested when the subspaces of optimal configurations have orthonormal bases with entries which come from certain finite alphabets; we call this condition flatness or almost flatness [DF07, STDJ07, XZG05, Din06, GR09]. Combinatorial designs will be used to construct such fusion frames and algebraic number theory will come into play when characterizing when such flat fusion frames can exist. Various sorts of difference sets have been used to construct optimal packings of lines [DF07, SH03, XZG05, Din06,

GR09, BH15, GR09] and, more generally, subspaces [BP15, Cre08]. However, the construction of the subspace packings are both of a different flavor than the construction in this paper, as will be explained after the construction has been presented.

The main results of the paper are as follows:

- New constructions of infinite classes of flat (Theorem 24) and sparse, almost flat (Theorem 27) equichordal tight fusion frames using semiregular divisible difference sets;
- Integrality conditions for the existence of certain classes of flat, tight fusion frames, including flat equichordal (Theorem 30) and flat equisoclinic (Corollary 32);
- A construction of Grassmannian packings and fusion frames from ones known to exist (Theorem 38, Corollary 39) which generalizes different constructions in [LS73b, BCP$^+$13, Cre08, SAH14, CFM$^+$11], coupled with a proof of which desirable geometric properties are preserved; and
- Further characterizations and examples of pre-existing constructions, including a focus on Grassmannian packings which are not equichordal (Proposition 42).

We complete this section by introducing frames and basic notation (Section 1.2) that will be used throughout the paper. The now standard construction of optimal frames using difference sets will also be presented in Section 1.3 to motivate the later construction of optimal fusion frames using semiregular divisible difference sets. Then in Section 2, Grassmannian packings and fusion frames will be introduced in full generality, along with various results about their existence and optimality. The constructions of flat and sparse, almost flat equichordal tight fusion frames using semiregular difference sets appear in Section 3. Integrality conditions on flat tight fusion frames

follow in Section 4. Then in Section 5, we give generalizations, classifications, and examples of constructions from the literature of various Grassmannian packings that can be constructed from other such packings. Finally, a quick summary and some future directions of research are listed in Section 6.

1.2 Frames

Throughout the paper, $\mathbb{F}$ will always either denote $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Further for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} [n] &:= \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \\ M(\mathbb{F}, m, n) &:= \text{ the set of } m \times n \text{ matrices with entries in } \mathbb{F} \\ I_n &:= \ n \times n \text{ identity matrix} \\ 0_{m\times n} &:= \ m \times n \text{ zero matrix.} \end{aligned}$$

For $A \in M(\mathbb{F}, m, n)$, we write $\mathrm{col}(A)$ for the column span of A. The abbreviation ONB for orthonormal basis will also be used.

Frames are generalizations of orthonormal bases which mimic the reconstruction properties of orthonormal bases (i.e.: $\forall x, x = \sum \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i$) but may have some redundancy (i.e., be linearly dependent) [CK12]. They were introduced in [DS52] and have applications in signal and image processing [CK12, Dau92, Grö01], quantum mechanics and information theory [CGV11, RBKSC04], and more.

Definition 1. A finite sequence $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^k$ is a *frame* for $\mathbb{F}^k$ if there exist constants $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{F}^k, \qquad A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\langle x, e_i \rangle|^2 \leq B\|x\|^2. \tag{1}$$

A and B are called *frame bounds*. A frame is *tight* if A and B may be chosen so that $A = B$. A tight frame is *unit-norm (FUNTF)* if $\|e_i\| = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. A collection of unit-norm vectors $\{e_i\}$ (not just ones forming a frame) is called *equiangular* if for some α, $|\langle e_i, e_j \rangle| = \alpha$ for all $i \neq j$. A FUNTF which is equiangular is called an *equiangular tight frame (ETF)*. Finally, a frame is *flat* if each coordinate of the frame vectors is equal in magnitude and *almost flat* if each non-zero coordinate is equal in magnitude.

In this article, we will always be working with unit-norm vectors $\{e_i\}$ and $k > 1$. We will in particular be interested in flat, equiangular tight frames and their generalizations to higher dimensional measurements.

Example 2. An example of a flat ETF is

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Then $|\langle e_i, e_j \rangle| = 1/3 + 2/3\delta_{i,j}$ and each coordinate has modulus $1/\sqrt{3}$. One can obtain this ETF by removing the first row of the so-called 4×4 Walsh-Hadamard and scaling the columns by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$.

Frames have a number of associated operators.

Theorem 3. *Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{F}^k$. The matrix $L \in M(\mathbb{F}, k, n)$ which has the vectors as columns*

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} e_1 & e_2 & \dots & e_n \end{pmatrix}$$

is called the synthesis operator*. Its adjoint is the* analysis operator*. The* Gram operator *L^*L has $\langle e_j, e_i \rangle$ as the i, j entry. The* frame operator *LL^* may be represented for all $x \in \mathbb{F}^k$ as*

$$(LL^*)\, x = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i e_i^* \right) x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i. \tag{2}$$

Finally, $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is a tight frame precisely when there exists* $A > 0$ *such that the* $LL^* = AI_k$*. This means in particular that the rows of* L *are orthogonal and have norm* $\sqrt{A}$ *and also that tight frames mimic – up to constant* A *– the reconstruction property which orthonormal bases satisfy:*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{F}^k, \qquad Ax = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle x, e_i \rangle e_i. \tag{3}$$

The idea behind many applications of frames is to use a tight frame to encode a vector $x \in \mathbb{F}^k$ as the sequence of inner products $\{\langle x, e_i \rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ (called the *frame coefficients*) and then transmit or process these inner products. In an ideal world, transmitted frame coefficients would be received in perfect condition, and x could be reconstructed via Equation 2. However, the frame coefficients are often corrupted by noise and erasures. As a very simplified example,

$$\{\langle x, e_1 \rangle + \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \langle x, e_4 \rangle + \epsilon_4, \ldots, \langle x, e_n \rangle + \epsilon_n\}$$

could be received, where the second and third frame coefficients have been lost in transmission and all of the coefficients have been degraded by some sort of additive noise $\{\epsilon_i\}$. By considering redundant frames rather than orthonormal bases, one has more flexibility with construction and also a more robust representation. Goyal *et al.* proved that a unit-norm frame is *optimally robust against* (*o.r.a.*) noise and one erasure if the frame is tight [GKK01]. Furthermore, a unit-norm frame is o.r.a. multiple erasures if it is Grassmannian [SH03, HP04].

Definition 4. The *coherence* (in [BK06] and contemporaneous publications: *maximal frame correlation*) of any collection of unit-vectors $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^k$ is

$$\mu(\{e_i\}) = \max_{1 \le i < j \le n} \{|\langle e_i, e_j \rangle|\}. \tag{4}$$

Fixing, n, k, and $\mathbb{F}$, a sequence of unit-norm vectors $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^k$ is called a *Grassmannian frame* if it is a solution to

$$\min\{\mu(\{e_i\}) : \{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^k \text{ FUNTF}\}.$$

Coherence plays an important role in the appropriateness of using certain measurement systems in sparsity-based methods like compressed sensing (see, for example, [Ela10, FR13]). The following theorem concerns the so-called *Welch bound*, and has been proven in a number of classical texts; see [SH03] for a proof using modern frame theory language and [vLS66] for a more classical, graph theoretic approach.

Theorem 5. *Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{F}^k$ be a collection of unit-norm vectors (not necessarily a frame). Then*

$$\mu(\{e_i\}) \geq \sqrt{\frac{n-k}{k(n-1)}}. \tag{5}$$

Furthermore, equality holds in (5) if and only if $\{e_i\}$ is an equiangular tight frame (ETF).

Thus, equiangular tight frames are automatically Grassmannian frames. Although Grassmannian frames exist for all choices of $\mathbb{F}$, n, and k, ETFs only exist for certain choices of $\mathbb{F}$, n, and k. For example, when $k = 2$, then there is no real ETF of 4 or more vectors and no complex ETF of 5 or more vectors. Examples of Grassmannian frames of n vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$ are the first n $2n$-complex-roots of unity, represented as vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$ [BK06]. Usually in the parameter regime where an ETF does not exist, an explicit construction of a Grassmannian frame is not known, and instead is numerically approximated (see, for example [TDJS05, Slo]). There are some known constructions of non-ETF Grassmannian frames called *orthoplex sequences* (see, for example [GR09, BH15]); we will discuss the generalization of these to subspaces in the next section.

Much of what is known about equiangular tight frames is related to combinatorics, making them elusive creatures which are associated with beautiful mathematics. For example, real equiangular frames have functorial equivalence with α-regular 2-graphs, where α depends on n and k [BP05, HP04], and the existence of strongly regular graphs with certain parameters is equivalent to the existence of particular real equiangular tight frames [LS73a, Wal09]. A survey of known construction

methods and existence results of equiangular tight frames may be found in [FM15].

1.3 Difference Sets

Given the close relationship between ETFs and combinatorial objects, it should not be so surprising that one class of constructions of ETFs uses difference sets and characters [SH03, DF07, GR09, XZG05]. For a general reference about difference sets and character theory, see [Pot95].

Definition 6. Let G be a finite abelian group of size n. Define $\widehat{G}$ to be the collection of all homomorphisms $\chi : G \to S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$. Endowed with pointwise multiplication, $\widehat{G}$ forms a group which is isomorphic to G. The elements are called *characters* and the character χ_0 which maps all elements of G to 1 is called the *principal character*.

For any subset $S \subseteq G$ and any character $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, we define the following element in $\mathbb{C}$

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{s \in S} \chi(s).$$

Characters satisfy certain orthogonality relations.

Lemma 7. Let G be a finite abelian group of size n. Then

$$\chi(G) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \chi \neq \chi_0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} \chi(g) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } g = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } g \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

The orthogonality relations are important to us because of their application to character tables.

Definition 8. Let G be a finite abelian group of size n. Let X_G be an $n \times n$ matrix with rows labeled by elements of G and columns by elements of $\widehat{G}$. Define the element in row g column χ to be $\chi(g)$. We call X_G the *character table* of G.

By construction, each element of X_G has modulus 1. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 7 that $(1/\sqrt{n})X_G$ is an orthogonal matrix.

Example 9. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$, the integers mod n. Then the $n \times n$ (properly scaled) discrete Fourier transform matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & e^{-2\pi i/n} & e^{-2\pi i 2/n} & \dots & e^{-2\pi i(n-1)/n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & e^{-2\pi i(n-1)/n} & e^{-2\pi i 2(n-1)/n} & \dots & e^{-2\pi i(n-1)(n-1)/n} \end{pmatrix}$$

is X_G.

Example 10. Let $G = \oplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{Z}_2$, binary sequences of length r. Then the Sylvester Hadamard matrix formed by the r-fold Kronecker product (see Definition 36) of

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is X_G (with lexicographic ordering on G and $\widehat{G}$).

We note that for a character table to have real entries, G can not have any elements of order greater than 2. Thus, Example 10 is in some sense the canonical example of a real character table. Since the rows of character tables are equal norm and orthogonal, if we take any subset $S \subset G$ and choose a submatrix of X_G with rows denoted by S and columns spanning all of $\widehat{G}$, the columns of the submatrix will always form a flat FUNTF after appropriate scaling (Theorem 3). In order to generate an ETF, we must be more careful about how we select the rows.

Definition 11. Let G be a finite abelian group of size n. If $D \subseteq G$ is a subset of size k such that the multiset

$$\Delta(D) = \{d_i - d_j : d_i, d_j \in D, d_i \neq d_j\}$$

contains λ copies of each non-identity element of G, then we say that D is a (n, k, λ)-difference set.

We can characterize difference sets using sums of character evaluations as in [Tur65].

Lemma 12. *D is a (n, k, λ)-difference set in G if and only if*

$$|\chi(D)|^2 = \begin{cases} k^2 & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0 \\ k - \lambda & \text{if } \chi \neq \chi_0 \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

The basic idea of the proof is applying characters to the following element of the group ring $\mathbb{C}G$

$$\left(\sum_{g \in D} g\right) + \left(\sum_{h \in D} -h\right) = (k - \lambda)0 + \lambda G$$

and using Lemma 7. Examples of constructions of ETFs using difference sets in $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$ or $\oplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{Z}_2$ appeared in [SH03, DF07, GR09], while the following theorem may be found in [XZG05].

Theorem 13. *For an abelian group G of size n, let $D \subseteq G$ of size k. We will write the elements of D without indices, but set $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as an enumeration of $\widehat{G}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we define the vector*

$$e_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\chi_i(g)\right)_{g \in D} \in \mathbb{F}^k.$$

Then $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an ETF if and only if D is a (n, k, λ)-difference set in G.

The key insight of the proof is to rework Equation 6 to represent inner products of the frame vectors:

$$|\langle (\chi(g))_{g \in D}, (\tilde{\chi}(g))_{g \in D} \rangle|^2 = \begin{cases} k^2 & \text{if } \chi(\tilde{\chi})^{-1} = \chi_0 \\ k - \lambda & \text{if } \chi(\tilde{\chi})^{-1} \neq \chi_0 \end{cases} = \begin{cases} k^2 & \text{if } \chi = \tilde{\chi} \\ k - \lambda & \text{if } \chi \neq \tilde{\chi} \end{cases}.$$

2 Grassmannian fusion frames

We begin this section by generalizing the concepts from the last section.

2.1 Fusion frames

Fusion frames, originally called *frames of subspaces*, were introduced by Casazza and Kutyniok in [CK04]. There are many potential applications of fusion frames in areas such as coding theory [Bod07], distributed sensing [CKL08], and neurology [RGJ06]. Please see [Chapter 13] of [CK12] for a more general overview of fusion frames.

Definition 14. A *fusion frame (with respect to* $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^n$*)* for $\mathbb{F}^k$ is a finite collection of subspaces $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in $\mathbb{F}^k$ and positive weights $\{\nu_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that there exist $0 < A \leq B < \infty$ satisfying

$$A\|x\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i^2 \|P_i x\|^2 \leq B\|x\|^2,$$

where P_i is an orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{W}_i$. If $A = B$, we say that the fusion frame is *tight*. If $A = B = 1$, then the fusion frame is called *Parseval*. Parseval fusion frames are referred to as *weighted projective resolutions of the identity* in [Bod07].

In this article, the weights will always be 1 (as in done in [KPCL09] and elsewhere), and the dimensions of the subspaces always equal to a fixed number m. (See [BE13, EG16, BLR15] for interesting results about packings and combinatorial design when the dimensions of the subspaces are unequal.) We postpone our discussion about the generalization of equiangularity to subspaces until the Section 2.2 and focus now on notation. The following result is a special case of [Theorem 3.2] in [CK04].

Theorem 15. *Given a collection of* m*-dimensional subspaces* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{F}^k$*, we fix for each* $i \in [n]$ *an ONB* $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ *for the subspace* $\mathcal{W}_i$ *and denote by* L_i *the matrix* $(e_1^i e_2^i \dots e_m^i) \in M(\mathbb{F}, k, m)$*. (For most of our results, it does not matter with ONB we choose for each* $\mathcal{W}_i$*.) We note that* $P_i = L_i L_i^*$*. We further define*

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 & L_2 & \dots & L_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

The fusion frame operator *is LL^*, which similar to Equation 2, satisfies for all $x \in \mathbb{F}^k$*

$$(LL^*)\, x = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} L_i L_i^* \right) x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i x. \tag{7}$$

Like (3), a fusion frame is tight with bound A if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i = A I_k, \tag{8}$$

which holds precisely when the rows of LL^* are orthogonal and have norm $\sqrt{A}$.

If we can choose ONB for the subspaces such that the entries of L all have the same modulus, then we call the fusion frame *flat*, and similarly if all of the nonzero entries of L have the same modulus, we say it is *almost flat*.

Fusion frames may either be viewed as generalizations of frames or special types of frames. In the former sense, we are merely replacing the projections (modulo constant multiples) of vectors $x \in \mathbb{F}^k$ (on line (1)) onto the subspace spanned by each frame vector with projections onto subspaces of dimensions possibly higher than 1. In the latter sense, we consider a fusion frame to be a frame with subcollections of frame vectors which group in nice ways. This can be seen when the columns of L as defined in Theorem 15 are treated as a collection of individual vectors rather than as a collection of ONB.

2.2 Grassmannian packings

Definition 16. For $1 \leq m \leq k$, set $Gr(k, m)$ to be the collection of m dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. $Gr(k, m)$ is called a *Grassmannian*. $Gr(k, m)$ may be endowed with many mathematical structures, but we shall only be concerned with the metric space structure induced by the *chordal distance* (see, [CHS96])

$$d_c(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) = [m - \text{trace}(P_i P_j)]^{1/2},$$

for $\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j \in Gr(k,m)$, where P_i is the orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{W}_i$.

The *Grassmannian packing problem* is the problem of finding n elements in $Gr(k,m)$ so that the minimal distance between any two of them is as large as possible. A numerical approach to solving this problem may be found in [DHST08], and a list of various packings is posted on [Slo]. Finding Grassmannian frames is equivalent to solving the Grassmannian packing problem for $Gr(k,1)$ restricted to unit-norm frames (increasing the chordal distance corresponds to decreasing the coherence). It is natural to ask what kind of structures one can obtain when considering the Grassmannian packing problem for $m > 1$. There is a generalization of the Welch bound (cf. Theorem 5) known as the *simplex bound*, found in [Ran55, CHS96, KPCL09]:

Theorem 17. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset Gr(k,m)$, then*

$$d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) \leq \frac{m(k-m)n}{k(n-1)}.$$

When $d_c(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j)$ is constant for all $i \neq j$, we call $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ an equichordal Grassmannian packing *(not necessarily a fusion frame). We also have*

$$\min_{i,j\in[n],i\neq j} d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) = \frac{m(k-m)n}{k(n-1)}$$

if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an equichordal tight fusion frame. *For fixed parameters n, m, k, and $\mathbb{F}$, the minimizers $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $\min_{i,j\in[n],i\neq j} d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j)$ all called* optimal Grassmannian packings. *If an optimal Grassmannian packing is a fusion frame, then it is a* Grassmannian fusion frame.

It is only possible to saturate the simplex bound when the number of subspaces is not too large. There is another bound which works on a small extended range.

Definition 18. Define

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k) = \begin{cases} k^2 & ; \quad \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C} \\ \frac{k(k+1)}{2} & ; \quad \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R} \end{cases}$$

This is known as *Gerzon's bound* [LS73a].

Theorem 19. *[Ran55, BH15, CHS96, Hen05] Let* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset Gr(k,m)$. *If* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is an equichordal tight fusion frame, then* $n \leq \mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k)$. *When* $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k) < n \leq 2(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k)-1)$,

$$\min_{i,j\in[n],i\neq j} d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i,\mathcal{W}_j) \leq \frac{m(k-m)}{k}.$$

This bound is called the orthoplex bound. *If the orthoplex bound is saturated and* $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k) < n \leq 2(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k)-1)$ *is satisfied, then we call* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *an* orthoplectic Grassmannian packing.

An *orthoplectic Grassmannian packing* is an optimal Grassmannian packing as it maximizes the minimum distance between subspaces. Notice however, that when $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k) \geq n$, a packing which saturates the orthoplex bound need not be optimal, since in theory it could still saturate the better simplex bound. On the other end, when $n > 2(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F},k)-1)$, no configurations can saturate the orthoplex bound. Some examples of constructions of equichordal packings may be found at [Cre08, CHR$^+$99, KPCL09, BP15] and of orthoplectic Grassmannian packings here [SS98, BH15, GR09].

We may also generalize geometric spread among elements of a given Grassmannian packing in other ways, which all coincide when $m = 1$. What follows is a summary of different characterizations from [LS73b, ET07, BCP$^+$13, BG73, Cre08], in particular [Theorem 2.3] of [LS73b], [Theorem 1] of [BG73], and [p. 4] of [Cre08].

Definition 20. Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset Gr(k,m)$ (not necessarily a fusion frame) with corresponding ONB as the columns of $\{L_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Then we say

- $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is *equichordal* when for all $i,j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$, $\operatorname{trace}(L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i)$ is constant;
- $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is *strongly simplicial* when for all $i,j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$, $L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i$ has the same set of eigenvalues; and

- $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is *equiisoclinic* when there exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$, $L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i = \alpha I_m$.

If $\rho_1, \rho_2, \ldots, \rho_m$ are the eigenvalues of $L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i$, then for all $\ell \in [m]$ the $\theta_\ell \in [0, \pi/2]$ which satisfy $\cos(\theta_\ell) = \rho_\ell$ are called the *principal angles* between $\mathcal{W}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_j$.

Thus if a tight fusion frame is equichordal, strongly simplectic, equiisoclinic, or orthoplectic Grassmannain, it is a Grassmannian fusion frame since all of those configurations, when they exist, have optimal pairwise chordal distances.

If $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset Gr(k, m)$ is an equiisoclinic tight fusion frame then α is called the *equiisoclinic parameter* and must equal

$$\alpha = \frac{mn - k}{k(n-1)}.$$

This follows from Theorem 17 and Definition 17 since for all $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha m &= \operatorname{trace}(\alpha I_m) = \operatorname{trace}(L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i) \\ &= \operatorname{trace}(L_j L_j^* L_i L_i^*) = \operatorname{trace}(P_j P_i) \\ &= m - d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_j, \mathcal{W}_i) = m - \frac{m(k-m)N}{k(n-1)} = m\left(\frac{mn-k}{k(n-1)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Some constructions and characterizations of equiisoclinic packings are in [ET06, ET07, ET14, Hog77, LS73b, CHR$^+$99, SS98], and examples of strongnly simplicial packings may be found in [Cre08].

As mentioned in the introduction, data may be corrupted by noise and/or erasures. In order to measure the resilience of a fusion frame representation of data against noise and erasures, one may use a deterministic or a stochastic signal model. The former case was analyzed in [Bod07, CK08] and the latter in [KPCL09]. Note that in [Bod07], equiisoclinic Parseval fusion frames are called 2-*uniform*, parallel to the terminology used for Grassmannian frames in [BP05]. The specific models

are explained in the respective papers. We simply summarize the results concerning optimally robust fusion frames. With a deterministic signal model, an equidimensional tight fusion frame is o.r.a. one subspace erasure if the weights ν_i are equal and o.r.a. two subspace erasures if it is equiisoclinic. The original signal can be recovered exactly when the measurement on one subspace is lost or corrupted if, further, the equiisoclinic tight fusion frame has parameters satisfying $mn > k$ and $n > 1$. With a stochastic signal model, a fusion frame is o.r.a. against noise if it is tight, a tight fusion frame is o.r.a. one subspace erasure if the dimensions of the subspaces are equal, and a tight fusion frame is o.r.a. multiple subspace erasures if it is equichordal. Equiisoclinic tight fusion frames are also proven to be deterministically optimal in block sparse recovery [SAH14, EKB10]. There are also applications of strongly simplicial configurations [Cre08], although some apparent drawbacks may be seen in [PWTH16].

3 Equichordal Tight Fusion Frames via Semiregular Divisible Difference Sets

The construction in this section of equichordal tight fusion frames uses semiregular divisible difference sets.

Definition 21. Let G be a finite abelian group of size mn and $D \subseteq G$ a subset of size k. Further let $N \leq G$ be a subgroup of size n. Finally consider the multiset $\Delta(G) = \{d_i - d_j : d_i, d_j \in D, d_i \neq d_j\}$. We say that D is a $(m, n, k, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$-*divisible difference set* if Δ contains each element of $(G \cap N^c)$ λ_2 times and each element of $(N \cap \{0\}^c)$ λ_1 times. If further $k > \lambda_1$ and $k^2 - \lambda_2 mn = 0$, we call D *semiregular*.

The difference sets defined in Definition 11 are $(1, n, k, \lambda, \cdot)$-divisible difference sets. (λ_2 is

superfluous since $G = N$.) By a simple counting argument, we see that for a $(m, n, k, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$-divisible difference set,

$$k(k-1) = \lambda_1(n-1) + \lambda_2(mn-n). \tag{9}$$

As before, we characterize divisible difference sets using sums of character evaluations [Dav98].

Lemma 22. D is a $(m, n, k, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$-divisible difference set in G relative to N if and only if

$$|\chi(D)|^2 = \begin{cases} k^2 & \text{if } \chi = \chi_0 \\ k - \lambda_1 & \text{if there is an } h \in N \text{ with } \chi(h) \neq 1 \\ k^2 - \lambda_2 mn & \text{if } \chi \neq \chi_0 \text{ and } \chi(h) = 1 \text{ for all } h \in N \end{cases}$$

We will make use of a stronger type of duality than simply $G \cong \widehat{G}$. (For a proof, see, for example [Fol16].)

Lemma 23. For any subgroup $N \leq G$,

$$N^\perp = \{\chi \in \widehat{G} : \chi(h) = 1 \text{ for all } h \in N\}$$

is a subgroup of $\widehat{G}$ (the *annihilator*, alternatively, the characters *principal on* N) which is isomorphic to G/N. More precisely, the mapping of $\chi \in N^\perp$ to $\chi' \in \widehat{G/N}$ where

$$\chi' : G/N \to S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}, \quad \chi'(g+N) := \chi(g)$$

is an isomorphism.

We now have all of the elements we need to present the construction of Grassmannian fusion frames using divisible difference sets. The basic idea is to remove the rows corresponding to a semiregular divisible difference set from a character table similar to what we did in Theorem 13 and then cluster the columns according to cosets of the annihilator of N in $\widehat{G}$. As before, for

simplicity in notation, the elements of the difference set are expressed simply as g, without any index.

Theorem 24. *Let D be a semiregular $(m, n, k, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$-divisible difference set in G relative to N. Let $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be an enumeration of $N^\perp$, and let $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a set of coset representatives of $\widehat{G}/N^\perp$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$\left\{ e_j^i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \left((\chi_i \eta_j)(g) \right)_{g \in D} \right\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{F}^k$$

is a set of m flat orthonormal vectors in $\mathbb{F}^k$. If we further set for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{W}_i = \operatorname{span}\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$, then $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an equichordal tight fusion frame for $\mathbb{F}^k$ with frame bound nm/k consisting of n m-dimensional subspaces.

Proof. The vectors are flat by construction. Since D is semiregular, $k^2 - \lambda_2 mn = 0$. Plugging this into Lemma 22 and using Lemma 23, we obtain

$$|\langle (\chi(g))_{g \in D}, (\tilde{\chi}(g))_{g \in D} \rangle|^2 = \begin{cases} k^2 & \text{if } \chi = \tilde{\chi} \\ k - \lambda_1 & \text{if } \chi(\tilde{\chi}^{-1}) \notin N^\perp \\ 0 & \text{if } \chi(\tilde{\chi}^{-1}) \in N^\perp \cap \{\chi_0\} \end{cases} . \tag{10}$$

Fix $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and choose $j, \tilde{j} \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Then using Equation 10 we can compute

$$\left| \langle e_j^i, e_{\tilde{j}}^i \rangle \right|^2 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = \tilde{j} \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq \tilde{j} \end{cases}$$

since

$$(\chi_i \eta_j)(\chi_i \eta_{\tilde{j}})^{-1} = \eta_j (\eta_{\tilde{j}})^{-1} \in N^\perp.$$

Thus for each i, $\{e_j^i\}_j$ is a set of flat orthonormal vectors.

Since $\{\chi_i \eta_j : j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ is an enumeration of $\hat{G}$. The matrix

$$L = \left(e_1^1 | e_2^1 | \cdots | e_m^1 | e_1^2 | \cdots e_m^n \right)$$

is the result of removing the rows corresponding to D from X_G, rescaling the entries by $1/\sqrt{k}$, and permuting the columns. Hence the rows of L are equal-norm of norm $\sqrt{nm/k}$ and orthogonal. Thus by Theorem 15, $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a tight fusion frame with bound nm/k.

Note that by Equation 10, the modulus of the inner product of any e_j^i and $e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}$ with $i \neq \tilde{i}$ is constant, namely $\sqrt{k-\lambda_1}/k$. We would like to show that the fusion frame is equichordal. We begin by defining for each $i \in [n]$, $L_i = (e_1^i e_2^i \dots e_m^i)$. We note that for any $i \neq \tilde{i}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{trace}(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i) &= \operatorname{trace}(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} (L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}})^*) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{\tilde{j}=1}^{m} \left| \langle e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}, e_j^i \rangle \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{m^2(k-\lambda_1)}{k^2},
\end{aligned}$$

independent of which $i \neq i'$ we started with. Thus it follows from Theorem 17 that $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an equichordal tight fusion frame. □

Example 25. We give an example of a equichordal tight fusion frame formed using a semiregular divisible difference set following the construction algorithm in [Section 2] of [Dav98]. Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_6$. Then X_G is the Kronecker tensor product (see Definition 36) of the (appropriately scaled) 2×2 discrete Fourier transform matrix / Sylvester Hadamard and the 6×6 discrete Fourier transform matrix (see Examples 9 and 10). For $N = \{(0,0),(1,0),(0,3),(1,3)\}$ and $N^\perp = \{(0,0),(0,2),(0,4)\}$,

$$D = \{(0.0),(0,1),(0,2),(0,4),(1,0),(1,5)\}$$

is a $(4,3,6,2,3)$-divisible difference set, which is semiregular since $6 > 2$ and $6^2 - 3 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 = 0$. For

$\zeta = e^{2\pi i/6}$

$$L_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \zeta^4 & \zeta^2 \\ 1 & \zeta^2 & \zeta^4 \\ 1 & \zeta^4 & \zeta^2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \zeta^2 & \zeta^4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \zeta^5 & -1 & \zeta \\ \zeta^4 & 1 & \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^2 & 1 & \zeta^4 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \zeta & -1 & \zeta^5 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$L_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \zeta^4 & \zeta^2 \\ 1 & \zeta^2 & \zeta^4 \\ 1 & \zeta^4 & \zeta^2 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & \zeta^5 & \zeta \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } L_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \zeta^5 & -1 & \zeta \\ \zeta^4 & 1 & \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^2 & 1 & \zeta^4 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \\ \zeta^5 & 1 & \zeta \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is not only equichordal but also strongly simplicial, since for all $i \neq \tilde{i}$, the singular values of $(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i)$ are $1, 0, 0$.

Question: Are all equichordal tight fusion frames, which are constructed via a semiregular divisible difference set as in Theorem 24 also strongly simplicial?

Lemma 26. For a subgroup $N \leq G$, let $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be an enumeration of $N^\perp$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j(g) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } g \in N \\ 0 & \text{if } g \notin N \end{cases}$$

Further, let $\{h_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^m$ be a set of coset representatives of G/N. Then for any $\eta \in N^\perp$,

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \eta(h_\ell) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } \eta = \chi_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \eta \neq \chi_0 \end{cases}$$

Proof. For each $\eta_j \in N^\perp$, we consider the character η_j' on G/N defined in Lemma 23. Then we can apply Lemma 7 over the group G/N to obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j(g) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j'(g+N) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } g+N = N \\ 0 & \text{if } g+N \neq N \end{cases}$$

The proof of the second claim is similar.

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \eta(h_\ell) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \eta'(h_\ell+N) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } \eta = \chi_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \eta \neq \chi_0 \end{cases}$$

□

Theorem 27. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i = \operatorname{span}\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m\}_{i=1}^n$ be a equichordal tight fusion frame as constructed in Theorem 24, with all other notation the same. Further let $\{h_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^m$ be a set of coset representatives of G/N and define*

$$U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1(h_1) & \eta_2(h_1) & \cdots & \eta_m(h_1) \\ \eta_1(h_2) & \eta_2(h_2) & \cdots & \eta_m(h_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \eta_1(h_m) & \eta_2(h_m) & \cdots & \eta_m(h_m) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ define

$$\tilde{L}_i := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \tilde{e}_1^i & \tilde{e}_2^i & \cdots & \tilde{e}_m^i \end{array} \right) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} e_1^i & e_2^i & \cdots & e_m^i \end{array} \right) U^*.$$

Then for all $i \in 1, \ldots, n$, $\mathcal{W}_i = \operatorname{span}\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ and the vectors $\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}_{j=1,i=1}^{m,n}$ are almost flat and each vector has support size k/m.

Proof. We first note that U is unitary. This follows from Lemma 26.

If $x \in \mathcal{W}_i$, then there exists some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^m$ such that $L_i\alpha = x$. But then $x = L_i\alpha = L_iU^*U\alpha = \tilde{L}_i(U\alpha)$ and $x \in \text{span}\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$. Similarly, $\text{span}\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}_{j=1}^m \supseteq \mathcal{W}_i$. Thus the $\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}$ yield the same fusion frame as the $\{e_j^i\}$ in Theorem 24.

We now would like to characterize the entries of the $\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}$. Fix $g \in D$, $\ell \in 1, \ldots, m$, and $i \in 1, \ldots, n$. Then we may apply Lemma 26 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{e}_\ell^i(g) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{km}} \sum_{j=1}^m (\chi_i\eta_j)(g)\overline{\eta_j(h_\ell)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{km}}\chi_i(g) \sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j(g(h_\ell)^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{km}}\chi_i(g) \begin{cases} m & \text{if } g(h_\ell)^{-1} \in N \\ 0 & \text{if } g(h_\ell)^{-1} \notin N \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{m}}{\sqrt{k}}\chi_i(g) & \text{if } g(h_\ell)^{-1} \in N \\ 0 & \text{if } g(h_\ell)^{-1} \notin N \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

We would like to show that for any $i \in 1, \ldots, n$, $\{\tilde{e}_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ is a set of orthonormal vectors. As shown in Theorem 24, each set $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ is orthonormal. Thus we have

$$\tilde{L}_i^*\tilde{L}_i = UL_i^*L_iU^* = UU^* = I_m$$

Since each $\tilde{e}_j^i$ is unit-norm and $\chi_i(g)$ is always unimodular, we can characterize how many entries of any given vector are nonzero, namely k/m. Note that this means that $k/m \in \mathbb{N}$ for semiregular divisible difference sets. □

Note that for a fixed $j \in 1, \ldots, m$, the support of each $\tilde{e}_j^i$ is the same. The difference is the component-wise modulation by $\chi_i(g)$.

There are two papers in the literature now which in some sense use difrerence sets to construct

equichordal tight fusion frames [Cre08, BP15]. The construction in the former paper involves difference sets of non-abelian groups, like the symplectic groups. The subspaces for the Grassmannian packing are created under orbits of the non-abelian groups. Thus in that construction, one does not have direct control over whether the bases or projections associated to the subspaces are sparse or flat. The latter construction starts with a (n, k, λ)-difference set D in an abelian group. Then instead of restricting X_G to the rows corresponding to D, the rows outside of D are zeroed out, resulting in n vectors in $\mathbb{F}^n$ which span a k-dimensional subspace. The elements of D are all shifted by an element in G to obtain a new difference set and new set of n vectors in $\mathbb{F}^n$ which span a k-dimensional subspace. This process is repeated for all elements of G, resulting in n different subspaces. One can find very space ONBs for the subspaces, namely, the k standard orthonormal basis vectors representing the support set $D - g$ for each $g \in G$.

Since divisible difference sets can sometimes be constructed using standard difference sets [Pot95], there is the question of whether the construction in Theorem 24 is ever equivalent to the construction in [BP15]. In order for the constructions to be equivalent, it is clearly necessary that the number of subspaces and dimension of the ambient space need to be equal. Since the construction in [BP15] results in n subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^n$, we would need a semiregular divisible difference set with $n = k$ for Theorem 24 to yield the same fusion frame. We plug $n = k$ and the semiregular

condition $k^2 - \lambda_2 mn = 0$ into Equation 9 to obtain a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} & k(k-1) = \lambda_1(n-1) + \lambda_2(mn-n) \\ & \Leftrightarrow \lambda_2 mk - k = \lambda_1 k - \lambda_1 + k\lambda_2(m-1) \\ & \Leftrightarrow k(\lambda_2 m - 1 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2(m-1)) = -\lambda_1 \\ & \Leftrightarrow k(\lambda_1 + 1 - \lambda_2) = \lambda_1. \end{aligned}$$

However, $k > \lambda_1$, so the previous line cannot be true. Thus the two constructions are not equivalent.

4 Integrality Conditions

The goal of this section is to prove certain integrality conditions that must be satisfied for a Grassmannian fusion frame $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}$ to be flat or almost flat. The results are generalizations of the conditions in [STDJ07] for flat ETFs to exist and similarly use Theorem 29, which concerns algebraic integers, as the main mathematical tool in the proofs. Fur further reading on algebraic integers, see a standard algebra text like [DF03].

Definition 28. The *algebraic integers* are the roots of monic polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Theorem 29. *The intersection of the algebraic integers with the rationals is the integers.*

As a simple example of this fact, we note that the square root of a positive integer is either an integer or irrational.

Theorem 30. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subring of the algebraic integers which is closed under conjugation. Further let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an equichordal tight fusion frame of n m-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an ONB of $\mathcal{W}_i$ and set the basis elements to be the columns of the matrix L_i. If*

for all $i \in [n]$ the entries of $\sqrt{k}L_i$ are in $\mathcal{A}$, then

$$\frac{km(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We note that when $m = 1$, this yields the same result about flat ETFs as [Theorem 18] in [STDJ07].

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a ring closed under conjugation and applying Definitions 16 and 20 for $i \neq j$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &\ni \operatorname{trace}(k^2 L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i) \\ &= k^2 \operatorname{trace}(P_i P_j) \\ &= \frac{k^2 m(mn-k)}{k(n-1)} \\ &= \frac{km(mn-k)}{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{Q} = \mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{Z}$ (Theorem 29), it follows that $\frac{km(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Corollary 31. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subring of the algebraic integers (not necessarily closed under complex conjugation). Further let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an equichordal fusion frame of n m-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$ with associated projections $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^n$. If for all $i \in [n]$ the entries of kP_i are in $\mathcal{A}$, then*

$$\frac{km(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. The result follows by porism of the proof of Theorem 30. □

Corollary 32. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subring of the algebraic integers which is closed under conjugation. Further let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an equiisoclinic tight fusion frame of n m-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an ONB of $\mathcal{W}_i$ and set the basis elements to be the columns of the matrix L_i. If for all $i \in [n]$ the entries of $\sqrt{k}L_i$ are in $\mathcal{A}$, then*

$$\frac{k(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. Since the fusion frame is equiisoclinic, it follows from Defintion 20 that $\alpha = \frac{mn-k}{k(n-1)}$ and

$$k^2 L_i^* L_j L_j^* L_i = k^2 \alpha I_k$$

has entries in $\mathcal{A}$. Applying Theorem 29, we obtain $k^2\alpha = \frac{k(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. □

Corollary 33. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an equichordal fusion frame of n m-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an ONB of $\mathcal{W}_i$ and set the basis elements to be the columns of the matrix L_i. If for all $i \in [n]$ the entries of $\sqrt{k}L_i$ are ℓth roots of unity for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\frac{km(mn-k)}{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We note that this result is weaker than the corresponding result, [Corollary 19] in [STDJ07], due to the fact that the equichordal condition, even when $m = 1$, is squared relative to the ETF condition.

Proof. For $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/\ell}$, the set

$$\{a_0 + a_1\zeta + a_2\zeta^2 + \ldots + a_{\ell-1}\zeta^{\ell-1} : a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is a subring of the algebraic integers which is closed under conjugation. □

Another integrality condition is as follows.

Theorem 34. *Let the columns of $\sqrt{k}L \in M(\mathbb{F}, k, n)$ be a tight frame with entries which are all qth roots of unity with $q = p^s$, p prime. Then the following hold.*

- *[STDJ07] p divides n;*
- *[KP03] If $q = 2$, then $k = n = 2$ or 4 divides n.*

The statement of [Theorem 20] in [STDJ07] includes the columns of $\sqrt{k}L$ being an ETF as a hypothesis, but the proof only uses the fact that the columns form a tight frame. One can always form a flat, real tight frame (i.e., $q = 2$) by removing rows of a Hadamard matrix and appropriately scaling. An $n \times n$ Hadamard matrix only exists if $n = 2$ or 4 divides n [Hor07]. Theorem 34 tells us that we can only form real, flat tight frames with dimensions that suggest they could have came from a Hadamard matrix.

Question: Must the analysis operator of each real, flat tight frame be an appropriately scaled submatrix of a Hadamard matrix?

Corollary 35. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a tight fusion frame of n m-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an ONB of $\mathcal{W}_i$ and set the basis elements to be the columns of the matrix L_i. If for all $i \in [n]$ the entries of $\sqrt{k}L_i$ are qth roots of unity for some $q = p^s$ with p prime, then p divides mn.*

Proof. This follows form Theorem 34 and Theorem 15. □

The specific examples of flat equichordal fusion frames constructed via semiregular divisible difference sets which we have thus far explicitly computed have not been equiisoclinic. Thus, one would hope to be able to use the integrality condition Corollary 32 to show that fusion frames with the same parameters cannot be flat and equiisoclinic. However for the class of semiregular difference sets found in [Theorem 2.3.6] of [Pot95] with parameters

$$\left(\frac{q^{2n-2s}(q^s-1)}{q-1}, q^s, \frac{q^{2n-s-1}(q^s-1)}{q-1}, \frac{q^{2n-s-1}(q^{s-1}-1)}{q-1}, \frac{q^{2n-s-2}(q^s-1)}{q-1}\right),$$

satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{k(mn-k)}{n-1} &= \frac{\frac{q^{2n-s-1}(q^s-1)}{q-1}\left(\frac{q^{2n-s}(q^s-1)}{q-1}-\frac{q^{2n-s-1}(q^s-1)}{q-1}\right)}{q^s-1} \\ &= \frac{q^{2n-s-1}(q^s-1)}{(q-1)^2}\left(q^{2n-s}-q^{2n-s-1}\right) \\ &= \frac{q^{4n-2s-2}(q^s-1)(q-1)}{(q-1)^2} \\ &= q^{4n-2s-2}\sum_{t=0}^{s-1} q^t \in \mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

That does not imply that a flat equiisoclinic fusion frame with these parameters exists. However, we cannot preclude the existence of such a flat equiisoclinic fusion frame based on the integrality conditions. Similarly, we have for the semiregular divisible difference sets constructed in [Dav92] with parameters $(4, 3^{2a}, 2\cdot(3^{2a}-3^a), 3^{2a}-2\cdot 3^a, 3^{2a}-2\cdot 3^a+1)$,

$$\frac{k(mn-k)}{n-1} = 4\cdot 3^{2a} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

5 Constructing New Grassmannian Packings from Old

A common method of constructing new optimal Grassmannian packings out of already known ones is to use a Kronecker product or Kronecker-like product. We make note of the following standard definition and properties.

Definition 36. For $A \in M(\mathbb{F}, r, s)$ and $B \in M(\mathbb{F}, p, q)$, with the ith row and jth column of A denoted by $a_{i,j}$, we define the *Kronecker product* $A \otimes B \in M(\mathbb{F}, rp, sq)$ as

$$A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1}B & \dots & a_{1,s}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{r,1}B & \dots & a_{r,s}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Kronecker product is nicely related to other matrix operations.

Proposition 37. *Let A, B, C, D be matrices with elements in $\mathbb{F}$. The following identities hold:*

- *If $B + C$ is defined, then $A \otimes (B + C) = A \otimes B + A \otimes C$;*
- *If $A + B$ is defined, then $(A + B) \otimes C = A \otimes C + B \otimes C$;*
- *If AC and BD are defined, then $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$;*
- $(A \otimes B)^* = A^* \otimes B^*$.
- *If A and B are square, then* $\operatorname{trace}(A \otimes B) = \operatorname{trace}(A) \operatorname{trace}(B)$.
- *If A has singular values $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^r$ and B has singular values $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^s$, then $A \otimes B$ has singular values $\{\sigma_i \rho_j\}_{i=1,j=1}^{r,s}$.*

A certainly incomplete summary of such constructions making use of the Kronecker product in the literature follows. We will often use the more general term *tensor* instead of Kronecker product to circumvent awkward phrasing. In [LS73b], the authors tensor real equiangular lines (not necessarily a frame) with orthogonal matrices to obtain equiisoclinic packings (not necessarily a fusion frame). They achieve this indirectly by tensoring the Gram matrix of the equiangular lines with an identity matrix ([proof of Theorem 3.7], [Remark 4.2]). The same construction was repeated in [SAH14] [Theorem 4] but specifically for the case of ETFs (although the authors falsely assume that all Grassmannian frames are ETFs). Instead of starting with an ETF, the author of [Cre08] in [Proposition 12] tensors the projections of a equichordal Grassmannian fusion frame with an identity matrix to obtain another equichordal Grassmannian fusion frame. Finally, in [BCP$^+$13] [Corollary 5], each column vector in a truncated orthonormal basis is tensored with a unitary matrix representing the different subspaces of a particular type of tight fusion frame to obtain a new tight fusion frame, called the Naimark complement and in [Theorem 7], a specific

application of this starting with a collection of ONBs for the entire space is used to obtain a equiisoclinic Grassmannian fusion frame. Furthermore, [CFM+11] essentially has the construction from Corollary 39 but in the specific case of building new tight fusion frames from old ones, without a focus on the geometric properties.

We now present a construction which generalizes the ones listed above. The theorem also shows that the construction preserves various desired properties separately.

Theorem 38. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of m-dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{F}^k$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ of $\mathcal{W}_i$. Further let $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of unitaries in $M(\mathbb{F}, r, r)$. For each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ define*

$$\overline{e}_j^i = e_j^i \otimes U_i \in M(\mathbb{F}, rk, r),$$

$$\overline{L}_i = (\overline{e}_1^i \overline{e}_2^i \dots \overline{e}_m^i) \in M(\mathbb{F}, rk, rm), \text{ and}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i = \operatorname{col} \overline{L}_i \in Gr(rm, rk).$$

Then the following statements hold.

1. *For each $i \in [n]$, the columns of $\overline{L}_i$ are a set of rm orthonormal vectors in $\mathbb{F}^{rk}$;*
2. *$\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is equichordal (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is;*
3. *$\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is strongly simplicial (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is;*
4. *$\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is equiisoclinic (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is;*
5. *$\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ saturates the orthoplex bound if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ does, but they cannot both be orthoplectic Grassmannian packings; and*
6. *$\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a tight fusion frame if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is. In this case, they have the same fusion frame bound.*

Proof. We begin by computing blocks of $\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}}$ for $i, \tilde{i} \in [n]$, making use of Proposition 37 freely. We note that for $j, \tilde{j} \in [m]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\overline{e}_j^i)^* \overline{e}_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}} &= (e_j^i \otimes U_i)^* (e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}} \otimes U_{\tilde{i}}) \\
&= \left((e_j^i)^* (e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}) \right) \otimes \left((U_i)^* U_{\tilde{i}} \right) \\
&= \langle e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}, e_j^i \rangle \otimes \left((U_i)^* U_{\tilde{i}} \right) \\
&= \langle e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}, e_j^i \rangle \left((U_i)^* U_{\tilde{i}} \right) \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

When $i = i'$, Equation 11 simplifies to

$$(\overline{e}_j^i)^* \overline{e}_{\tilde{j}}^i = \langle e_{\tilde{j}}^i, e_j^i \rangle I_r = \begin{cases} I_r; & \tilde{j} = j \\ 0_{r \times r}; & \tilde{j} \neq j \end{cases}.$$

In this case, the off-diagonal blocks of the Gram matrix $\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_i$ are the zero matrix and the diagonal blocks are the identity. Thus the columns of $\overline{L}_i$ are orthonormal, and Statement 1 is proven.

To prove Statements 2 – 5, we are concerned with the properties of $\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}}$, or more specifically $\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}} (\overline{L}_{\tilde{i}})^* \overline{L}_i$, when $i \neq \tilde{i}$. As usual, we define L_i to be the matrix with columns $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ (from the original packing). Then the $(j, \tilde{j})$ entry of $L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}}$ is precisely $\langle e_{\tilde{j}}^{\tilde{i}}, e_j^i \rangle$. Thus, it follows from Equation 11 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}} &= (L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}}) \otimes U_i^* U_{\tilde{i}}, \text{ and further} \\
\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}} (\overline{L}_{\tilde{i}})^* \overline{L}_i &= \left((L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}}) \otimes U_i^* U_{\tilde{i}} \right) \left((L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i) \otimes U_{\tilde{i}}^* U_i \right) \\
&= \left(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i \right) \otimes \left(U_i^* U_{\tilde{i}} U_{\tilde{i}}^* U_i \right) \qquad (12) \\
&= \left(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i \right) \otimes I_r. \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Definition 20, that $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}\}_{i=1}^n$ is equichordal if and only if trace $\left(\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}} (\overline{L}_{\tilde{i}})^* \overline{L}_i \right)$ is constant for all $i \neq \tilde{i}$, which happens if and only if trace $\left(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i \right)$ is constant for all $i \neq \tilde{i}$.

Thus, Statement 2 is proven. Similarly, $\overline{L_i}^*\overline{L_{\tilde{i}}}(\overline{L_{\tilde{i}}})^*\overline{L_i}$ has spectrum independent of $i \neq \tilde{i}$ (resp. is for all $i \neq \tilde{i}$ equal to a constant multiple times the identity) if and only if $L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i$ has spectrum independent of $i \neq \tilde{i}$ (resp. is for all $i \neq \tilde{i}$ equal to a constant multiple times the identity). Hence, Statements 3 and 4 are proven.

If $\{\mathcal{W}\}_{i=1}^n$ (resp., $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}\}_{i=1}^n$) saturates the orthoplex bound, then the maximum value of the chordal distance satisfies for some $i, j \in [n]$

$$\frac{m(k-m)}{k} = d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) = m - \operatorname{trace}(L_i L_j^* L_j L_i^*)$$
$$\left(\text{resp. } \frac{rm(rk-rm)}{rk} = \frac{rm(k-m)}{k} = d_c^2(\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i, \overline{\mathcal{W}}_j) = mr - \operatorname{trace}(\overline{L}_i \overline{L}_j^* \overline{L}_j \overline{L}_i^*)\right).$$

We can see from Equation 13 that $\operatorname{trace}(\overline{L}_i \overline{L}_j^* \overline{L}_j \overline{L}_i^*) = r \operatorname{trace}(L_i L_j^* L_j L_i^*)$. Thus $\{\mathcal{W}\}_{i=1}^n$ has at least one pair of subspaces at the orthoplex bound if and only if $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}\}_{i=1}^n$ does as well. However, such a configuration is only optimal when $2(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F}, k) - 1) \geq n > \mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F}, k)$ (resp., $2(\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F}, rk) - 1) \geq n > \mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F}, rk)$). Unless $r = 1$, n cannot fall in both ranges.

To prove Statement 6, we define

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} L_1 & L_2 & \cdots & L_n \end{pmatrix} \in M(\mathbb{F}, k, mn), \text{ and}$$
$$\overline{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{L}_1 & \overline{L}_2 & \cdots & \overline{L}_n \end{pmatrix} \in M(\mathbb{F}, rk, rmn).$$

We will make use of the fact that $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (resp., $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$) is a tight fusion frame if an only if LL^* (resp., $\overline{LL^*}$) is a constant multiple of the identity (Theorem 15). We calculate the respective

matrix products as the sum of the rank one tensors formed from the columns.

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{LL}^* &= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{e}_j^i (\overline{e}_j^i)^* \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (e_j^i \otimes U_i)(e_j^i \otimes U_i)^* \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(((e_j^i (e_j^i)^*) \otimes U_i (U_i)^* \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(((e_j^i (e_j^i)^*) \otimes I_r \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (e_j^i (e_j^i)^* \right) \otimes I_r \\
&= LL^* \otimes I_r.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\overline{LL}^* = AI_{rk}$ if and only if $LL^* = AI_k$. □

We can actually generalize Theorem 38 a bit more.

Corollary 39. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of m-dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{F}^k$ and $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a collection of r-dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{F}^\ell$. For each $i \in [n]$, fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_j^i\}_{j=1}^m$ of $\mathcal{W}_i$ and $\{f_t^i\}_{t=1}^r$ of $\mathcal{V}_i$. Further define for each $i \in [n]$ $U_i = (f_1^i \dots f_r^i)$. Finally for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [m]$ define*

$$\overline{e}_j^i = e_j^i \otimes U_i \in M(\mathbb{F}, k\ell, r),$$

$$\overline{L}_i = (\overline{e}_1^i \overline{e}_2^i \dots \overline{e}_m^i) \in M(\mathbb{F}, k\ell, rm), \text{ and}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i = \operatorname{col} \overline{L}_i \in Gr(rm, k\ell).$$

Then the following statements hold.

1. *For each $i \in [n]$, the columns of $\overline{L}_i$ are a set of rm orthonormal vectors in $\mathbb{F}^{rk}$;*

2. $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is equichordal (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *and* $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *are;*

3. $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is strongly simplicial (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *and* $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *are;*

4. $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is equiisoclinic (not necessarily a fusion frame) if and only if* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *and* $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *are; and*

6. $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is a tight fusion frame if and only if* $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *and* $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *are. In this case, the fusion frame bound of* $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is the product of the fusion frame bounds of*$\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *and* $\{\mathcal{V}_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

Proof. The proof of the corollary follows the proof of Theorem 38 quite closely. We note that the U_is are partial isometries, so when $i = i'$, Equation 11 still simplifies, and the off-diagonal blocks of the Gram matrix $\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_i$ are the zero matrix and the diagonal blocks are the identity. Thus the columns of $\overline{L}_i$ are orthonormal, and Statement 1 is proven.

For the proof of Statements 2 – 4, we can only simplify down to Equation 12. That is,

$$\overline{L}_i^* \overline{L}_{\tilde{i}} (\overline{L}_{\tilde{i}})^* \overline{L}_i = \left(L_i^* L_{\tilde{i}} L_{\tilde{i}}^* L_i\right) \otimes \left(U_i^* U_{\tilde{i}} U_{\tilde{i}}^* U_i\right)$$

We now make use of the fact (Proposition 37) that for arbitrary square matrices A and B, $\operatorname{trace}(A \otimes B) = \operatorname{trace}(A)\operatorname{trace}(B)$ and for arbitrary matrices the singular values of $A \otimes B$ are simply the products of all of the singular values of A with each of the singular values of B.

Statement 5 from Theorem 38 does not carry over well.

Finally, we note that Statement 6 is simply [Theorem 4] from [CFM$^+$11]. □

A nice example of a construction of a class of equiisoclinic tight fusion frames which may also be constructed using Theorem 38 is found in [Kin13].

Example 40. The *Walsh functions* $\omega_j : [0,1] \to \{\pm 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $j \geq 0$, are piecewise constant functions which have the following properties:

1. $\omega_j(0) = 1$ for all $j \geq 0$,

2. ω_j has precisely j sign changes (zero crossings), and

3. $\langle \omega_j, \omega_\ell \rangle = \delta_{j\ell}$.

Walsh functions have been used for over 100 years by communications engineers to minimize cross talk. The first four Walsh functions are

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_0 &= \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}, \\
\omega_1 &= \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/2)} - \mathbb{1}_{[1/2,1]}, \\
\omega_2 &= \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/4)} - \mathbb{1}_{[1/4,3/4)} + \mathbb{1}_{[3/4,1]}, \text{ and} \\
\omega_3 &= \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/4)} - \mathbb{1}_{[1/4,1/2)} + \mathbb{1}_{[1/2,3/4)} - \mathbb{1}_{[3/4,1]},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{1}_A$ is the function that takes the value 1 on A and 0 off of A, A measurable. By sampling the first 2^n Walsh functions at the points $\frac{\ell}{2^n}$, one obtains a *sequency-ordered Walsh Hadamard* matrix; that is,

$$W_n = \left(\omega_j \left(\frac{\ell}{2^n} \right) \right)_{0 \leq j, \ell < 2^n}$$

is a $2^n \times 2^n$ matrix with orthogonal columns and entries equal to ± 1. There is a speedy algorithm, the Fast Hadamard (or Walsh) Transform, for multiplying a vector by such a matrix [Hor07]. Let W_n be the $2^n \times 2^n$ Walsh-Hadamard matrix indexed by $0, \ldots, 2^n - 1$. Then ([Theorem 13], [Kin13])

$$\left\{ \mathcal{W}_i = \text{span}_{0 \leq k \leq 2^m - 1} \left\{ (W_n(j, i + k2^{n-m}))_{2^m \leq j \leq 2^n - 1} \right\} \right\}_{0 \leq i \leq 2^{n-m} - 1}$$

is a tight fusion frame for $\mathbb{F}^{2^n - 2^m}$ with frame bound $\frac{2^n}{2^n - 2^m}$ consisting of 2^{n-m} 2^m-dimensional subspaces which is equiisoclinic with parameter $\alpha = \left(\frac{2^m}{2^n - 2^m} \right)^2$.

Although on first appearance, the construction seems to simply involve sampling points of functions in communications engineering and no tensor products, after permutations, one can obtain the same equiisoclinic tight fusion frame be tensoring the vectors of an ETF formed from a truncated $2^m \times 2^m$ Sylvester Hadamard with 2^m copies of the same 2^{n-m} Sylvester Hadamard.

Another way to generate an fusion frames from a other fusion frames is via subspace complementation [BCP+13].

Lemma 41 ([MBI92, QZL05])**.** Let $\mathcal{W}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_j$ be subspaces of $\mathbb{F}^k$. The nonzero principal angles between $\mathcal{W}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_j$ are equal to the nonzero principal angles between their orthogonal complements $\mathcal{W}_i^\perp$ and $\mathcal{W}_j^\perp$.

Proposition 42. *Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n \in Gr(\mathbb{F}, m, k)$. Then the following statements about $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n \in Gr(\mathbb{F}, k-m, k)$ hold.*

1. *$\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a tight fusion frame if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n$ is a tight fusion frame;*
2. *$\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an equichordal tight fusion frame if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n$ is an equichordal tight fusion frame;*
3. *$\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a strongly simplicial tight fusion frame if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n$ is a strongly simplicial tight fusion frame; and*
4. *$\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an orthoplectic Grassmannian packing if and only if $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n$ is an orthoplectic Grassmannian packing.*

Proof. Statement 1 is [Corollary 6] from [BCP+13]. Statement 2 also follows from [Corollary 6] of [BCP+13], in particular since Lemma 41 implies that $d_c(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) = d_c(\mathcal{W}_i^\perp, \mathcal{W}_j^\perp)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. For Statement 3, we can also conclude from Lemma 41 that if the set of principal angles between

$\mathcal{W}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_j$ is constant over all pairs $i \neq j$, then the set of principal angles between $\mathcal{W}_i^\perp$ and $\mathcal{W}_j^\perp$ for any $i \neq j$ is also fixed. Finally, for Statement 4, $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an orthoplectic Grassmannian packing by Theorem 19 if $n > \mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{F}, k)$ and there exist $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \neq j$ such that

$$d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i^\perp, \mathcal{W}_j^\perp) = d_c^2(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{W}_j) = \frac{m(k-m)}{k} = \frac{(k-m)(k-(k-m))}{k}.$$

Since the number of subspaces and the dimension of the base space $\mathbb{F}^k$ does not change when taking orthogonal complements, $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ being an orthoplectic Grassmannian packing implies that $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^n$ is as well and vice versa. □

There are two huge differences when comparing the results of subspace complementation with the tensoring construction (Theorem 38). Initially, in contrast to the tensoring construction which always destroys the optimality of a orthoplectic Grassmannian packing, subspace complementation preserves it. We also note that subspace complementation does not preserve equiisoclinicity! We can see that in the following example.

Example 43. Let $\{\mathcal{W}_i\}_{i=1}^4 \in Gr(\mathbb{F}, 1, 3)$ be the subspaces spanned by the columns of the 4×4 Sylvester-Hadamard matrix with the first row removed (cf. Example 2):

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This fusion frame of 1-dimensional subspaces is actually an ETF and thus trivially equiisoclinic. Then the columns of the following matrices serve as ONB for $\{\mathcal{W}_i^\perp\}_{i=1}^4$ with $a = 1/\sqrt{(}2)$ and

$b = 1/\sqrt{(}6)$

$$L_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b & 0 \\ b & -a \\ b & a \end{pmatrix}, \; L_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b & 0 \\ -b & -a \\ b & -a \end{pmatrix}, \; L_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b & 0 \\ -b & -a \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix}, \; L_4 = \begin{pmatrix} -2b & 0 \\ b & -a \\ -b & -a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Although $\{\mathcal{W}_i^{\perp}\}_{i=1}^4$ is a strongly simplicial tight fusion frame, it is not equiisoclinic since, for example

$$L_3^* L_2 L_2^* L_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{7}{9} & \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \\ \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix} \neq AI_2.$$

Other constructions from old, for example using exterior products, appear in [Hog77].

6 Conclusion

In this paper, novel constructions of flat as well as sparse, almost flat equichordal tight fusion frames via semiregular divisible difference sets were presented which made full use of the associated group structure in order to partition vectors into spanning sets. Integrality conditions for the existence of certain classes of flat, tight fusion frames, including flat equichordal and flat equisoclinic were also presented. Numerous variants of tensor-like constructions which have appeared in the literature over the last few decades were generalized into one simple algorithm, which was proven to preserve geometric properties of interest. The properties of another main construction in the literature were also investigated.

There is often focus on finding equiisoclinic packings, while equichordal packings seem to be much more abundant. In [PWTH16], certain Grassmannian codes were found to have better kissing numbers and density than to an explicitly constructed equiisoclinic packing and also to almost within machine precision equichordal packings found via [DHST08]. The authors suggest that the

issue in using chordal distance to define configurations of codewords is that the chordal distance in extrinsically defined. The natural question is whether other distances can actually perform better for certain tasks and what sort of mathematical constructions optimal configurations with respect to those metrics would be like [CHS96, DHST08].

Future directions in research also include investigating the questions

- Must the analysis operator of each real, flat tight frame be an appropriately scaled submatrix of a Hadamard matrix?
- Are all equichordal tight fusion frames, which are constructed via a semiregular divisible difference set as in Theorem 24 also strongly simplicial?

and also numerically examining the performance of the Grassmannian fusion frames constructed in Theorem 27 in block sparse recovery.

References

[BCP+13] Bernhard G. Bodmann, Peter G. Casazza, Jesse D. Peterson, Ihar Smalyanau, and Janet C. Tremain, *Excursions in harmonic analysis*, vol. 1, ch. Fusion Frames and Unbiased Basic Sequences, pp. 19–34, Birkhäuser Boston, 2013.

[BE13] C. Bachoc and M. Ehler, *Tight p-fusion frames*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **35** (2013), no. 1, 1–15. MR 3053743

[BG73] Åke Björck and Gene H. Golub, *Numerical methods for computing angles between linear subspaces*, Math. Comp. **27** (1973), 579–594. MR 0348991

[BH15] Bernhard G. Bodmann and John Haas, *Achieving the orthoplex bound and constructing weighted complex projective* 2*-designs with Singer sets*, Preprint, 2015.

[BK06] J. J. Benedetto and J. D. Kolesar, *Geometric properties of Grassmannian frames for* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *and* $\mathbb{R}^3$, EURASIP Journal on Applied Signal Processing **49850** (2006), 17 pp.

[BLR15] Marcin Bownik, Kurt Luoto, and Edward Richmond, *A combinatorial characterization of tight fusion frames*, Pacific J. Math. **275** (2015), no. 2, 257–294.

[Bod07] Bernhard G. Bodmann, *Optimal linear transmission by loss-insensitive packet encoding*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **22** (2007), no. 3, 274–285. MR MR2311854 (2008c:42031)

[BP05] Bernhard G. Bodmann and Vern I. Paulsen, *Frames, graphs and erasures*, Linear Algebra Appl. **404** (2005), 118–146. MR MR2149656 (2006a:42047)

[BP15] Irena Bojarovska and Victoria Paternostro, *Gabor fusion frames generated by difference sets*, Preprint, 2015.

[CFM+11] Peter G. Casazza, Matthew Fickus, Dustin G. Mixon, Yang Wang, and Zhengfang Zhou, *Constructing tight fusion frames*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **30** (2011), 175–187.

[CGV11] Nicolae Cotfas, Jean Pierre Gazeau, and Apostol Vourdas, *Finite-dimensional Hilbert space and frame quantization*, J. Phys. A **44** (2011), no. 17, 17 pp.

[CHR+99] A. R. Calderbank, R. H. Hardin, E. M. Rains, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, *A group-theoretic framework for the construction of packings in Grassmannian spaces*, J. Algebraic Combin. **9** (1999), no. 2, 129–140. MR 1679247

[CHS96] John H. Conway, Ronald H. Hardin, and Neil J. A. Sloane, *Packing lines, planes, etc.: packings in Grassmannian spaces*, Experiment. Math. **5** (1996), no. 2, 139–159. MR 1418961 (98a:52029)

[CK04] Peter G. Casazza and Gitta Kutyniok, *Frames of subspaces*, Wavelets, frames and operator theory, Contemp. Math., vol. 345, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 87–113. MR MR2066823 (2005e:42090)

[CK08] ———, *Robustness of fusion frames under erasures of subspaces and of local frame vectors*, Radon transforms, geometry, and wavelets (New Orleans, LA, 2006), Contemp. Math., vol. 464, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008, pp. 149–160.

[CK12] Peter G. Casazza and Gitta Kutyniok (eds.), *Finite frames*, Birkhäuser Boston, 2012.

[CKL08] Peter G. Casazza, Gitta Kutyniok, and Shidong Li, *Fusion frames and distributed processing*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **25** (2008), no. 1, 114–132. MR MR2419707 (2009d:42094)

[Cre08] Jean Creignou, *Constructions of grassmannian simplices*, Preprint, 2008.

[Dau92] Ingrid Daubechies, *Ten lectures on wavelets*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, vol. 61, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1992. MR MR1162107 (93e:42045)

[Dav92] James A. Davis, *Almost difference sets and reversible divisible difference sets*, Archiv Der Mathematik **59** (1992), no. 6, 595–602.

[Dav98] ———, *New semiregular divisible difference sets*, Discrete Math. **188** (1998), no. 1-3, 99–109. MR 1630438

[DF03] David S. Dummit and Richard M. Foote, *Abstract algebra*, 3 ed., Wiley, The address, 2003.

[DF07] Cunsheng Ding and Tao Feng, *A generic construction of complex codebooks meeting the Welch bound*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **53** (2007), no. 11, 4245–4250.

[DHST08] I. S. Dhillon, R. W. Heath, Jr., T. Strohmer, and J. A. Tropp, *Constructing packings in Grassmannian manifolds via alternating projection*, Experiment. Math. **17** (2008), no. 1, 9–35. MR MR2410113 (2009f:51022)

[Din06] Cunsheng Ding, *Complex codebooks from combinatorial designs*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **52** (2006), no. 9, 4229–4235.

[DS52] R. J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer, *A class of nonharmonic Fourier series*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **72** (1952), 341–366. MR MR0047179 (13,839a)

[EG16] Martin Ehler and Manuel Gräf, *Harmonic decompositions on unions of Grassmannians*, Preprint, 2016.

[EKB10] Yonina C. Eldar, Patrick Kuppinger, and Helmut Bölcskei, *Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery*, IEEE Trans. Signal Process. **58** (2010), no. 6, 3042–3054.

[Ela10] Michael Elad, *Sparse and redundant representations*, Springer, New York, 2010, From theory to applications in signal and image processing, With a foreword by Alfred M. Bruckstein. MR 2677506 (2011k:94023)

[ET06] Boumédiène Et-Taoui, *Equi-isoclinic planes of Euclidean spaces*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **17** (2006), no. 2, 205–219. MR 2321381

[ET07] ———, *Equi-isoclinic planes in Euclidean even dimensional spaces*, Adv. Geom. **7** (2007), no. 3, 379–398.

[ET14] ———, *Infinite family of equi-isoclinic planes in Euclidean odd dimensional spaces and of complex symmetric conference matrices of odd orders*, Preprint, 2014.

[FM15] Matthew Fickus and Dustin G. Mixon, *Tables of the existence of equiangular tight frames*, Preprint, 2015.

[Fol16] Gerald B. Folland, *A course in abstract harmonic analysis*, second ed., Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2016. MR 3444405

[FR13] Simon Foucart and Holger Rauhut, *A mathematical introduction to compressive sensing*, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser, 2013.

[GKK01] Vivek K. Goyal, Jelena Kovačević, and Jonathan A. Kelner, *Quantized frame expansions with erasures*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **10** (2001), no. 3, 203–233. MR MR1829801 (2002h:94012)

[GR09] Chris Godsil and Aidan Roy, *Equiangular lines, mutually unbiased bases, and spin models*, European J. Combin. **30** (2009), no. 1, 246–262. MR 2460230

[Grö01] Karlheinz Gröchenig, *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis*, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2001. MR MR1843717 (2002h:42001)

[Hen05] O. Henkel, *Sphere-packing bounds in the Grassmann and Stiefel manifolds*, IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **51** (2005), no. 10, 3445–3456.

[Hog77] S. G. Hoggar, *New sets of equi-isoclinic n-places from old*, P Edinburgh Math Soc (1977), 287–291.

[Hor07] K. J. Horadam, *Hadamard matrices and their applications*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007. MR MR2265694 (2008d:05036)

[HP04] Roderick B. Holmes and Vern I. Paulsen, *Optimal frames for erasures*, Linear Algebra Appl. **377** (2004), no. 15, 31–51.

[Kin13] Emily J. King, *Grassmannian fusion frames*, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.1086`, 2013.

[KP03] George N. Karystinos and Dimitris A. Pados, *New bounds on the total squared correlation and optimum design of DS-CDMA binary signature sets*, IEEE Trans. Commun. **51** (2003), no. 1, 48–51.

[KPCL09] Gitta Kutyniok, Ali Pezeshki, Robert Calderbank, and Taotao Liu, *Robust dimension reduction, fusion frames, and Grassmannian packings*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **26** (2009), no. 1, 64–76. MR MR2467935

[LS73a] P. W. Lemmens and J. J Seidel, *Equiangular lines*, Journal of Algebra **24** (1973), no. 3, 494–512.

[LS73b] Piet W. H. Lemmens and Johan J. Seidel, *Equi-isoclinic subspaces of Euclidean spaces*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 76 Indag. Math. **35** (1973), 98–107.

[MBI92] Jianming Miao and Adi Ben-Israel, *On principal angles between subspaces in r^n*, Linear Algebra Appl. **171** (1992), 81–98.

[Pot95] Alexander Pott, *Finite geometry and character theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1601, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. MR 1440858

[PWTH16] Renaud-Alexandre Pitaval, Lu Wei, Olav Tirkkonen, and Camilla Hollanti, *Density of spherically-embedded Stiefel and Grassmann codes*, Preprint, 2016.

[QZL05] Li Qiu, Yanxia Zhang, and Chi-Kwong Li, *Unitarily invariant metrics on the Grassmann space*, SIAM. J. Matrix Anal. & Appl. **27** (2005), no. 2, 507–531.

[Ran55] R. A. Rankin, *The closest packing of spherical caps in n dimensions*, Proc Glasgow Math Assoc **2** (1955), 139–144.

[RBKSC04] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves, *Symmetric informationally complete quantum measurements*, J. Math. Phys. **45** (2004), no. 6, 2171–2180.

[RGJ06] C. J. Rozell, I. N. Goodman, and D. H. Johnson, *Feature-based information processing with selective attention*, Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2006. ICASSP 2006 Proceedings. 2006 IEEE International Conference on, vol. 4, IEEE, 2006, p. IV.

[SAH14] N. Mukund Sriram, B. S. Adiga, and K. V. S. Hari, *Grassmannian fusion frames and its use in block sparse recovery*, Signal Processing **94** (2014), 498–502.

[SH03] Thomas Strohmer and Robert W. Heath, Jr., *Grassmannian frames with applications to coding and communication*, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. **14** (2003), no. 3, 257–275. MR MR1984549 (2004d:42053)

[Slo] N. J. A. Sloane, *http://www2.research.att.com/ njas/grass/grasstab.html*, Online at http://www2.research.att.com/ñjas/grass/grassTab.html.

[SS98] P. W. Shor and N. J. A. Sloane, *A family of optimal packings in Grassmannian manifolds*, J. Algebraic Combin. **7** (1998), no. 2, 157–163. MR 1609881

[STDJ07] Mátyás A. Sustik, Joel A. Tropp, Inderjit S. Dhillon, and Robert W. Heath Jr, *On the existence of equiangular tight frames*, Linear Algebra Appl. **426** (2007), 619–635.

[TDJS05] J. A. Tropp, I. S. Dhillon, R. W. Heath Jr., and T. Strohmer, *Designing structured tight frames via alternating projection*, IEEE Trans. Info. Theory **51** (2005), no. 1, 188–209.

[Tur65] Richard J. Turyn, *Character sums and difference sets*, Pacific J. Math. **15** (1965), 319–346. MR 0179098

[vLS66] J. H. van Lint and J. J. Seidel, *Equilateral point sets in elliptic geometry*, P K Ned Akad A Math **69** (1966), no. 3, 335–348.

[Wal09] S. Waldron, *On the construction of equiangular frames from graphs*, Linear Algebra Appl. **431** (2009), 2228–2242.

[XZG05] Pengfei Xia, Shengli Zhou, and Georgios B. Giannakis, *Achieving the Welch bound with difference sets*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **51** (2005), no. 5, 1900–1907.